arXiv:1303.3735v2 [math.OC] 31 Mar 2013

Subgradient Algorithm, Stochastic Subgradient Algorithm, Incremental Subgradient Algorithm, and Set Location Problems

Nguyen Mau Nam[1], Nguyen Thai An[2], and Han Le[3]

Abstract. In recent years, important progress has been made in applying methods and techniques of convex optimization to many fields of applications such as location science, engineering, computational statistics, and computer science. In this paper, we present some simple algorithms for solving a number of new models of facility location involving sets which generalize the classical Fermat-Torricelli problem and the smallest enclosing circle problem. The general nondifferentiability of the models prevents us from applying gradient-type algorithms, so our approach is to use subgradient-type algorithms instead. The algorithms presented in this paper are easy to implement and applicable for a broad range of problems that are also suitable for teaching and learning convex optimization.

Key words. Subgradient method, stochastic subgradient method, incremental subgradient method, Fermat-Torricelli problem, generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem; smallest enclosing circle problem; generalized Sylvester problem

AMS subject classifications. 49J52, 49J53, 90C31.

1 Problem Formulation

In the early of the 17th century, the French mathematician Fermat introduced an optimization problem which asks for a point that minimizes the sum of the distances to three given points in the plane. This problem was solved by the Italian mathematician and physicist Torricelli. The problem is now called the *Fermat-Torricelli problem*, and it is one of the main problems that led to new developments of location science. A new model of facility location where the given points are replaced by a finite number of sets (not necessarily convex) has been introduced recently in [16]. Since then, many other set location models have been introduced and studied; see [14, 15, 20, 21] and the references therein. In particular, general models of facility location that involves both shortest distance and farthest distance functions to sets were introduced in [21]. These models generalize the Fermat-Torricelli problem and the *Sylvester smallest enclosing ball problem* which asks for the smallest circle that encloses a finite number of points in the plane.

In this paper, we focus only on the numerical aspect of the optimization models introduced in [21] specified to the finite dimensional case. In $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$, given a convex set F (not necessarily bounded) that contains the origin as an interior point, and given a target set Ω, the *minimal time function* defined by the *dynamic* F and the *target set* Ω is given by

$$T_F(x;\Omega) := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid (x+tF)\cap\Omega \neq \emptyset\}. \tag{1.1}$$

---

[1] Fariborz Maseeh Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Portland State University, Portland, OR 97202, United States (mau.nam.nguyen@pdx.edu). The research of Nguyen Mau Nam was partially supported by the Simons Foundation under grant #208785.

[2] Thua Thien Hue College of Education, 123 Nguyen Hue, Hue City, Viet Nam (thaian2784@gmail.com)

[3] Portland State University, Portland, OR 97202, United States (lehan@pdx.edu).

Similarly, for a bounded set Θ, the corresponding *maximal time function* is defined by

$$C_F(x;\Theta) := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \Theta \subseteq (x + tF)\}. \tag{1.2}$$

These functions are generalizations of the shortest distance function and the farthest distance function. In fact, when F is the closed unit Euclidean ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the minimal time function (1.1) reduces to the *shortest distance function/distance function*

$$d(x;\Omega) := \inf\{\|x - w\| \mid w \in \Omega\}, \tag{1.3}$$

and the maximal time function (1.2) reduces to the *farthest distance function*

$$M(x;\Omega) := \sup\{\|x - w\| \mid w \in \Theta\}. \tag{1.4}$$

Consider a finite collection of nonempty closed convex sets Ω_i for $i \in I$ and another finite collection of nonempty closed bounded sets Θ_j for $j \in J$ (not necessarily convex), the generalized Fermat-Torricelli introduced in [21] can be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\text{minimize } \mathcal{T}(x),\ x \in Q, \tag{1.5}$$

where Q is a convex constraint set, and the cost function $\mathcal{T}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}(x) := \sum_{i\in I} T_F(x;\Omega_i) + \sum_{j\in J} C_F(x;\Theta_j).$$

If F is closed unit Euclidean norm of $\mathbb{R}^n$, problem (1.5) reduces to a simpler version as below:

$$\text{minimize } \mathcal{D}(x) := \sum_{i\in I} d(x;\Omega_i) + \sum_{j\in J} M(x;\Theta_j),\ x \in Q. \tag{1.6}$$

In the case where all of the sets Ω_i for $i \in I$ and Θ_j for $j \in J$ reduce to singletons, and the constraint set Q is the Euclidean plane, the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.6) reduces to the Fermat-Torricelli problem for a finite number of points.

Another model of our interest is the *generalized Sylvester problem*:

$$\text{minimize } \mathcal{S}(x) := \max\{\mathcal{G}_1(x), \mathcal{G}_2(x)\} \text{ subject to } x \in Q, \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_1(x) := \max_{i\in I} T_F(x;\Omega_i)$ and $\mathcal{G}_2(x) := \max_{j\in J} C_F(x;\Theta_j)$.

Using different dynamics, we are able to obtain different versions of problem (1.5) and problem (1.7) involving distance functions generated by different norms of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and minimal/maximal time functions generated by different Minkowski gauges. It is also possible to use different dynamics F_i for $i \in I$ and E_j for $j \in J$, but we will not consider this for simplicity.

It is well-known that the Weiszfeld algorithm [12, 31] and its modifications provide effective tools for solving the classical Fermat-Torricelli involving a finite number of points. However, in the general case of problem (1.5) and problem (1.7), because of the nonsmoothness, there are not a lot of options for numerical algorithms for solving the problems other than subgradient-type algorithms. In fact, subgradient-type algorithms allow us to solve the problems in a very broad setting that involves distance functions generated by different norms and minimal time/maximal time functions generated by different Minkowski gauges; see .e.g. [20]. The classical subgradient method is known to be slow in general. Thus, it is not a good option when the number of target gets Ω_i for $i \in I$ and Θ_j for $j \in J$ are large. An new method called *incremental subgradient method* was developed in order to improve the performance of the subgradient method when the cost function is represented as a sum of a finite number of convex functions. A question is: can we develop a simpler algorithm that can be used for solving problem (1.5) and improving both afore-mentioned subgradient algorithms when the number of target sets is large? The *stochastic subgradient method* is an answer for this question. It has been shown by [27] that the stochastic subgradient method is an effective tool for solving large-scale Support Vector Machines (SVMs). This simple method also shows its effectiveness in solving the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.5).

In this paper, we first present the tools of convex analysis for minimal time and maximal time functions recently developed by the first author and his coauthors. Then we present simple implementation of three subgradient methods to problem (1.5) and problem (1.7) in the general forms as well as their specifications. The readers are referred to our recent paper [21] for theoretical studies of these problems. We also introduce and study new models of facility location called *directional location problems.*

Throughout the paper, we make the following standing assumptions and notations: *F is a nonempty closed convex set that contains the origin as an interior point; Ω_i for $i \in I$ are nonempty closed convex sets; Θ_j for $j \in J$ are nonempty closed bounded sets that are not singletons; $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm of $\mathbb{R}^n$; $I\!B$ is the closed unit Euclidean ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$; $I\!B(a;r)$ is the closed Euclidean ball with center a and radius r; $\mathbb{R}^+$ is the set of all nonnegative real numbers.*

2 Tools of Convex Analysis

In this section, we present some basic concepts and results of convex analysis. A systematic development of convex analysis can be found, for instance, in [17, 25]. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function. For $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a *subgradient* of f at $\bar{x}$ is a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies

$$\langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle \le f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The set of all subgradients of f at $\bar{x}$ is called the *subdifferential* of f at this point and is denoted by $\partial f(\bar{x})$. It is well-known that for a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, the subdifferential of the function at any point is a nonempty compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Subgradients of the minimal time function (1.1) and the maximal time function (1.2) obviously play a crucial role on developing subgradient-type algorithms for solving problems (1.5) and (1.7). In what follows, we present subdifferential formulas for these functions. It turns out that subgradients of the minimal time function (1.1) depends, first of all, on the *asymptotic cone* of the dynamic F:

$$F_\infty := \{d \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x + td \in F \text{ for all } t > 0 \text{ and for all } x \in F\}.$$

In our consideration, $0 \in F$, and F_∞ has the following simple representation:

$$F_\infty = \cap_{t>0} tF.$$

It is not hard to see that F_∞ is a closed convex cone, and it reduces to $\{0\}$ if and only if F is bounded.

Subgradients of the minimal time function (1.5) also depend on the following set

$$F^* := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, -x\rangle \le 1 \text{ for all } x \in F\}.$$

Thus, if we define $\sigma_F(w) := \sup_{x\in F}\langle w, x\rangle$, then

$$F^* := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sigma(-w) \le 1\}.$$

From the definitions, it is clear that when F is the closed unit Euclidean ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$, one has that $\sigma_F(w) = \|v\|$ and $F^* = I\!B$.

For a convex set Ω, the normal cone to Ω at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ is defined by

$$N(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, x - \bar{x}\rangle \le 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Omega\}.$$

Let us first start with a subdifferential formula for the minimal time function (1.1). For $\bar{x} \notin \Omega - F_\infty$ (this set reduces to Ω when F is bounded), the *projection* from $\bar{x}$ to Ω associated with the minimal time function (1.1) is

$$\Pi_F(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \{w \in \Omega \mid T_F(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \rho_F(w - \bar{x})\}.$$

Theorem 2.1 *Let Ω be a nonempty closed convex set.*

(i) *Suppose that F is bounded. Then*

$$\partial T_F(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \begin{cases} N(\bar{x}; \Omega) \cap F^* & \text{if } \bar{x} \in \Omega, \\ [-\partial \rho_F(w - \bar{x})] \cap N(w; \Omega) & \text{if } \bar{x} \notin \Omega, \end{cases}$$

for any $w \in \Pi_F(\bar{x}; \Omega)$.

(ii) *Suppose further that Ω is bounded. Then*

$$\partial T_F(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \begin{cases} N(\bar{x}; \Omega - F_\infty) \cap F^* & \text{if } \bar{x} \in \Omega, \\ [-\partial \rho_F(w - \bar{x})] \cap N(w; \Omega) & \text{if } \bar{x} \notin \Omega - F_\infty, \end{cases}$$

for any $w \in \Pi_F(\bar{x}; \Omega)$.

As a corollary, we obtain the next well-known formula for subdifferential of the distance function (1.3).

Corollary 2.2 *For a nonempty closed convex set* Ω*, the following representation holds:*

$$\partial d(\bar{x};\Omega) = \begin{cases} N(\bar{x};\Omega)\cap I\!B & \text{if } \bar{x}\in\Omega,\\ \{\dfrac{\bar{x}-\Pi(\bar{x};\Omega)}{d(\bar{x};\Omega)}\} & \text{if } \bar{x}\notin\Omega,\end{cases}$$

where $\Pi(\bar{x};\Omega)$ *is the Euclidean projection from* $\bar{x}$ *to* Ω*, which is a singleton, given by*

$$\Pi(\bar{x};\Omega) := \{w\in\Omega \mid d(\bar{x};\Omega) = \|\bar{x}-w\|\}. \tag{2.8}$$

As mentioned earlier, the maximal time function (1.2) is always convex. It subdifferential formula follows from a well-known formula for subdifferential of "max" function in convex analysis. For any $\bar{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n$, the *farthest projection* from $\bar{x}$ to Θ associated with the maximal time (1.1) is defined by

$$P_F(\bar{x};\Theta) := \{w\in\Theta \mid C_F(\bar{x};\Theta) = \rho_F(w-\bar{x})\}.$$

In the case where $F = I\!B$, this set becomes the *Euclidean farthest projection* from $\bar{x}$ to Θ:

$$P(\bar{x};\Theta) := \{w\in\Theta \mid M(\bar{x};\Theta) = \|\bar{x}-w\|\}.$$

Theorem 2.3 *Suppose that* Θ *is a compact set. Then* $S(\bar{x}) := \Pi_F(\bar{x};\Theta)$ *is a compact set and*

$$\partial C_F(\bar{x};\Theta) = \text{co}\cup_{w\in S(\bar{x})}[-\partial\rho_F(w-\bar{x})].$$

As a corollary, we obtain a simple formula for subdifferential for the farthest distance function (1.4).

Corollary 2.4 *Suppose that* Θ *is a compact set that is not a singleton. Then* $S(\bar{x}) := P(\bar{x};\Theta)$ *is a compact set and*

$$\partial M(\bar{x};\Theta) = \frac{\bar{x}-\text{co } S(\bar{x})}{M(\bar{x};\Theta)}.$$

The minimal time function (1.1) and the maximal time function (1.2) can be represented in terms of the Minkowski/gauge function associated with F, which is defined by

$$\rho_F(x) := \inf\{t\ge 0 \mid x\in tF\}. \tag{2.9}$$

In fact, one has the following representations:

$$T_F(x;\Omega) = \inf_{w\in\Omega}\rho_F(w-x),$$
$$C_F(x;\Theta) = \sup_{w\in\Theta}\rho_F(w-x).$$

The first formula was proved in [19], while the second formula can be derived from a similar formula dealing with the case where F is bounded; see [14]. From these formula, it is also not hard to show that both functions (1.1) and (1.2) are globally Lipschitz. The minimal time function (1.1) is convex when Ω is convex, and the maximal time function (1.2) is always convex despite the nonconvex nature of the target set Θ.

3 A Generalized Fermat-Torricelli Problem

3.1 The Subgradient Algorithm

The *subgradient method* was introduced in the 1960s by the work of Naum Z. Shor and others to deal with convex nonsmooth optimization problems. For a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, the subgradient method iteration (see [1, 28]) for solving the constrained optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } \ f(x), \ x \in Q, \tag{3.10}$$

is given by

$$x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q), \ V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, f(x_k)\},$$

where $w_k \in \partial f(x_k)$, $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$, x_1 is chosen, and $\Pi(u; Q)$ denotes the Euclidean projection from u to the set Q given by (2.8) if $u \notin Q$, and $\Pi(u; Q) = \{u\}$ if $u \in Q$.

In the subgradient method, at iteration k, we only need to find one subgradient of the cost function at x_k. Moreover, the constrained set Q must be simple enough to find the Euclidean projection.

In the case where the optimal value of the function V is finite, we are interested in finding a *suboptimal solution* of the problem, that is a point $x_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$f(x_\epsilon) - V < \epsilon.$$

Therefore, instead of investigating the convergence of (x_k) to an optimal solution, we care more about the convergence of (V_k) to the optimal value V.

When applying to the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.5), at iteration k, we need to find a subgradient u_{ki} of each component function $\varphi_i(x) = T_F(x; \Omega_i)$ for $i \in I$, and a subgradient v_{kj} of $\psi_j(x) = C_F(x; \Theta_j)$ for $j \in J$. By the well-known *subdifferential sum rule* of convex analysis

$$w_k := \sum_{i \in I} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J} v_{kj}$$

is a subgradient of $\mathcal{T}$ at x_k.

Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 as well as their specifications in Corollaries 2.2 and 2.4 provide us with a method of finding such a subgradient. Notice that if $x_k \in \Omega_i$, the subdifferential $\partial T_F(x_k; \Omega_i)$ always contains 0, so we can choose $u_{ki} = 0$. In the case where $x_k \notin \Omega_i$, a subgradient u_{ki} can be found by using a projection point w_{ki} of $\Pi_F(x_k; \Omega_i)$, and using subgradients of the Minkowski function. The readers are referred to [15] for different examples of computing subgradients of the minimal time function. In particular, if F is the closed unit Euclidean ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the formula for u_{ki} is explicit:

$$u_{ki} = \frac{x_k - w_{ki}}{\|x_k - w_{ki}\|}.$$

It is similar to determine v_{ki} at iteration k.

Let us now present a pseudocode for solving problem (1.5). For simplicity, we assume that F is bounded here and throughout the rest of the paper.

```
INPUT: $K$, $F$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{T}(x_1)$
FOR  $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
    Choose $p_{ki} \in \Pi_F(x_k; \Omega_i)$ and find $u_{ki} \in -\partial\rho_F(p_{ki} - x_k) \cap N(p_{ki}; \Omega_i)$
    for $i \in I$
    else
        set $u_{ki} := 0$ for $i \in I$
    end if
    Choose $q_{kj} \in P_F(x_k; \Theta_j)$ and find $v_{kj} \in -\partial\rho_F(q_{kj} - x_k)$ for $j \in J$
    Set $w_k := \sum_{i \in I} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J} v_{kj}$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

As a special case, let us present a pseudocode for solving problem (1.6).

```
INPUT: $K$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{D}(x_1)$
FOR  $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
        set $u_{ki} := \dfrac{x_k - \Pi(x_k; \Omega_i)}{d(x_k; \Omega_i)}$ for $i \in I$
    else
        set $u_{ki} := 0$ for $i \in I$
    end if
    Choose $q_{kj} \in P(x_k; \Theta_j)$ and set $v_{kj} := \dfrac{x_k - q_{kj}}{M(x_k; \Theta_j)}$ for $j \in J$
    Set $w_k := \sum_{i \in I} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J} v_{kj}$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{D}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{D}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

The readers are referred to [3] for different way of choosing the step sizes (α_k). Let us present below the convergence result for two important cases. The proof is given in [1, 3].

Theorem 3.1 *Under the standing assumptions made, suppose that the solution set of problem* (1.5) *is nonempty. If the sequence* (α_k) *converges to* 0 *and* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty$*, then the sequence* (V_k) *in the algorithms presented in this section converges to the optimal value of the problem. Moreover, if we assume additionally that* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty$*, then* (x_k) *also converges to an optimal solution of the problem.*

The subgradient algorithm exhibits slow convergence rates when applying to the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.5). One of the reasons is that in each iteration in order to get an improvement, we need to calculate all subgradients u_{ki} for $i \in I$ and v_{kj} for $j \in J$, and it is computationally expensive if the number of target sets is large. In order to overcome this shortcoming, the stochastic subgradient method and the incremental subgradient method provide other alternatives.

3.2 The Stochastic Subgradient Algorithm

For a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we say that $\widetilde{v}$ is called a *noisy (unbiased) subgradient* of f at $\bar{x}$ if the expected value $E(\widetilde{v}) \in \partial f(\bar{x})$. That means

$$\langle E(\widetilde{v}), x - \bar{x} \rangle \le f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The stochastic subgradient method for problem (3.10) can be formulated as follows:

$$x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q),\ V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, f(x_k)\},$$

where $E(\widetilde{w}_k) \in \partial f(x_k)$, $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$, x_1 is chosen, and $\Pi(u; Q)$ denotes the Euclidean projection from u to the set Q given by (2.8) if $u \notin Q$, and $\Pi(u; Q) = \{u\}$ if $u \in Q$.

Let us first present the simplest version of the stochastic subgradient method for problem (1.5). The main idea is that in each iteration, we do not have to scan through all the target sets in order to get a subgradient as in the subgradient method. We only need to choose uniformly at random one index t in the disjoint union of I and J, or find a subgradient $w_{kt} \in \partial T_F(x_k; \Omega_t)$ if $t \in I$, and find a subgradient $w_{kt} \in \partial C_F(x_k; \Theta_t)$ if $t \in J$. After that, define

$$\widetilde{w}_k := (|I| + |J|) w_{kt},$$

and perform the iteration $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$.

A more general method can be presented as follows. Fix a positive integer p such that $p \le |I| + |J|$. At the iteration k, we choose uniformly at random a nonempty set of indices A_k, $|A_k| = p$, that is a subset of the disjoint union of I and J. Set $I_k = A_k \cap I$ and $J_k = A_k \cap J$. Then for each $i \in I_k$, find $u_{ki} \in \partial T_F(x_k; \Omega_i)$, and for each $j \in J_k$, find $v_{kj} \in \partial C_F(x_k; \Theta_j)$. After that set

$$\widetilde{w}_k := (|I| + |J|) \frac{\sum_{i \in I_k} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J_k} v_{kj}}{p},$$

and perform the iteration $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$.

A similar method has been successfully applied to solving SVMs; see [27]. Let us now present a pseudocode for solving problem (1.5) with the use of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 as well as their specifications in Corollaries 2.2 and 2.4.

```
INPUT: $p$, $K$, $F$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step
sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{T}(x_1)$
FOR   $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Choose $A_k$, $|A_k| = p$, to be a nonempty subset of the disjoint
    union of $I$ and $J$, uniformly at random, and set $I_k = A_k \cap I$
    and $J_k = A_k \cap J$
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
    Choose $p_{ki} \in \Pi_F(x_k; \Omega_i)$ and find $u_{ki} \in -\partial \rho_F(p_{ki} - x_k) \cap N(w_{ki}; \Omega_i)$
    for $i \in I_k$
    else
        set $u_{ki} := 0$ for $i \in I_k$
    end if
    Choose $q_{kj} \in P_F(x_k; \Theta_j)$ and find $v_{kj} \in -\partial \rho_F(q_{kj} - x_k)$ for $j \in J_K$
    Set $\widetilde{w}_k := \dfrac{|I| + |J|}{p} (\sum_{i \in I_k} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J_k} v_{kj})$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

We can similarly write a pseudocode for solving problem (1.6).

```
INPUT: $p$, $K$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step
sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{D}(x_1)$
FOR   $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Choose $A_k$, $|A_k| = p$, to be a subset of the disjoint union of
    $I$ and $J$, uniformly at random, and set $I_k = A_k \cap I$ and $J_k = A_k \cap J$
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
        set $u_{ki} := \dfrac{x_k - \Pi(x_k; \Omega_i)}{d(x_k; \Omega_i)}$ for $i \in I_k$
    else
        set $u_{ki} := 0$ for $i \in I_k$
    end if
    Choose $q_{kj} \in P(x_k; \Theta_j)$ and set $v_{kj} := \dfrac{x_k - q_{kj}}{M(x_k; \Theta_j)}$ for $j \in J_k$
    Set $\widetilde{w}_k := \dfrac{|I| + |J|}{p} (\sum_{i \in I_k} u_{ki} + \sum_{j \in J_k} v_{kj})$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{D}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{D}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

As an example, let us consider the stochastic subgradient method applied to the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem for Euclidean balls. For a ball $\Omega := I\!\!B(a; r)$, using Corollaries 2.2 and 2.4, it is not hard to see that

$$\partial d(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \begin{cases} N(\bar{x}; \Omega) \cap I\!\!B & \text{if } \bar{x} \in \Omega, \\ \{\dfrac{\bar{x} - a}{\|\bar{x} - a\|}\} & \text{if } \bar{x} \notin \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\partial M(\bar{x};\Omega) = \begin{cases} I\!\!B & \text{if } \bar{x} = a, \\ \{\dfrac{\bar{x}-a}{\|\bar{x}-a\|}\} & \text{if } \bar{x} \neq a. \end{cases}$$

Example 3.2 Let $\Omega_i := I\!\!B(a_i; r_i)$ for $i \in I$ and $\Theta_j := I\!\!B(b_j; s_j)$ for $j \in J$, where $r_i \geq 0$ for every $i \in I$ and $s_j > 0$ for $j \in J$. We consider the stochastic subgradient method for solving problem (1.6). In each iteration, we choose one random index uniformly.

```
INPUT: $K$, $a_i, r_i$ for $i \in I$, $b_j, s_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{D}(x_1)$
FOR   $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Choose a random index $t$ uniformly in the disjoint union of $I$ and $J$
    if $t \in I$
        if  $x_k \notin \Omega_t$
            set $w_{kt} := \dfrac{x_k - a_t}{\|x_k - a_t\|}$
        else
            set $w_{kt} := 0$
        end if
    end if
    if $t \in J$
        if  $x_k \neq b_t$
            set $w_{kt} := \dfrac{x_k - b_t}{\|x_k - b_t\|}$
        else
            set $w_{kt} := 0$
        end if
    end if
    Set $\widetilde{w}_k := (|I| + |J|)w_{kt}$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{D}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{D}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

The readers are referred to [1] for more detail of the stochastic subgradient method.

3.3 The Incremental Subgradient Algorithm

Let us now present another improvement of the subgradient method. In [23], the authors developed an incremental subgradient method for solving the optimization (3.10), where f is represented as a sum of m convex functions f_i for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Their idea is to construct x_{k+1} based on x_k as follows:

$$x_{k+1} := \psi_{m,k},$$

where $\psi_{m,k}$ is obtained after m steps:

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi_{i,k} := P(\psi_{i-1,k} - \alpha_k g_{i,k}; Q)\\ &g_{i,k} \in \partial f_i(\psi_{i-1,k}),\ i = 1, \ldots, m,\end{aligned}$$

starting with $\psi_{0,k} := x_k$.

It has been experimentally observed in [23] that the incremental gradient method has a faster convergence rate compared with the subgradient method when m is large. Moreover, in the smooth case, the incremental gradient method often converges much faster than the steepest descent method when far from the eventual limit. Observe that the situation when f is represented as a sum of m functions applies directly to our generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.5).

When applying to the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem (1.5), the difference between the subgradient method and the incremental subgradient method is that at the iteration k, instead of scanning through all of the target sets and get an improvement of the cost function, the incremental subgradient method also scan through all of the target sets. However, it keeps changing the sequence at each target set. This also explains the difference between the stochastic subgradient method and the incremental subgradient method.

Let us now present a pseudocode for solving the generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem using the incremental subgradient method. For simplicity of notation, assume that $I = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $J = \{m + 1, \ldots, m + \ell\}$.

```
INPUT: K, $F$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of step
sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{T}(x_1)$
FOR $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Set $w_{k,0} := x_k$
    FOR $i = 1, \ldots, m$
        if $w_{k,i-1} \notin \Omega_i$
            Find $p_{k,i} \in \Pi_F(w_{k,i-1}; \Omega_i)$, find $u_{k,i} \in -\partial\rho_F(p_{k,i} - w_{k,i-1}) \cap N(p_{k,i}; \Omega_i)$,
            and set $w_{k,i} := \Pi(w_{k,i-1} - \alpha_k u_{k,i}; Q)$
        else
            Set $w_{k,i} = \Pi(w_{k,i-1}; Q)$
        end if
    FOR $j = m + 1, \ldots, m + \ell$
        Find $q_{k,j} \in P_F(w_{k,j-1}; \Theta_j)$, find $v_{k,j} \in -\partial\rho_F(q_{k,j} - w_{k,j-1})$,
        and set $w_{k,j} := \Pi(w_{k,j-1} - \alpha_k v_{k,j}; Q)$
    Set $x_{k+1} := w_{k,m+\ell}$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

4 A Generalized Sylvester Problem

4.1 The Subgradient Algorithm

Consider the function $\mathcal{S}$ given in (1.7). For $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the *active index set* at u is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(u) &:= \{i \in I \mid \mathcal{S}(u) = T_F(u;\Omega_i)\}, \\ A_2(u) &:= \{j \in J \mid \mathcal{S}(u) = C_F(u;\Theta_j)\}, \\ A(u) &:= A_1(u) \sqcup A_2(u). \end{aligned}$$

where $\sqcup$ is the *disjoint union* notation.

Let us present a pseudo code for solving problem (1.7) based on the subgradient algorithm.

```
INPUT: $K$, $F$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of
step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{S}(x_1)$
FOR $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Find an index $t \in A(x_k)$
    if $t \in A_1(x_k)$
        if $x_k \in \Omega_t$
            Find $p_t \in \Pi_F(x_k;\Omega_t)$ and find $w_k \in -\partial\rho_F(p_t - x_k) \cap N(w_k;\Omega_t)$
        else
            Set $w_k = 0$
        end if
    end if
    if $t \in A_2(x_k)$
        find $q_t \in P_F(x_k;\Omega_t)$ and find $w_k \in -\partial\rho_F(q_t - x_k)$
    end if
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

As a special case, let us present a pseudocode for solving problem (1.7), where F is the closed unit Euclidean ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$, based on the subgradient algorithm.

```
INPUT: $K$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, $\Theta_j$ for $j \in J$, and a sequence of
step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{S}(x_1)$
FOR  $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Find an index $t \in A(x_k)$
    if $t \in A_1(x_k)$
        if $x_k \notin \Omega_t$
            set $w_k = \dfrac{x_k - \Pi(x_k; \Omega_t)}{d(x_k; \Omega_t)}$
        else
            set $w_k = 0$
        end if
    end if
    if $t \in A_2(x_k)$
        choose $p_t \in P(x_k; \Theta_t)$ and set $w_k := \dfrac{x_k - p_t}{M(x_k; \Theta_t)}$
    end if
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

5 Directional Location Problems

5.1 Problems Formulations and Theoretical Analysis

Let v be a nonzero vector and let Ω be a nonempty closed set of a $\mathbb{R}^n$. The directional minimal time function associated with direction v and target set Ω is defined by

$$T_v(x; \Omega) = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid x + tv \in \Omega\}. \tag{5.11}$$

This function has recently been introduced and studied in [22]. Notice that the directional minimal time function (5.11) is a particular case of the minimal time function (1.1) when $F = \{v\}$. However, in this situation, the assumption that $0 \in \text{int } F$ is never satisfied.

Let us present some basic properties of the minimal time function (5.11). The detail and more properties of the function in infinite dimensions can be found in [22].

Proposition 5.1 *Let Ω be a nonempty closed set. The minimal time function* (5.11) *has the following properties:*
(i) $T_v(\bar{x}; \Omega) = 0$ *if and only if* $\bar{x} \in \Omega$*;*
(ii) dom $T_v(\cdot; \Omega) = \Omega - \text{cone}\,\{v\}$*;*
(iii) $T_v(\cdot; \Omega)$ *is lower semicontinuous;*
(iv) $T_v(\cdot; \Omega)$ *is convex if and only if* Ω *is convex.*

The first model we study in this section is a generalization of the Fermat-Torricelli problem. Given a finite number of nonzero vectors v_i for $i \in I$ and a finite number of nonempty closed target sets Ω_i for $i \in I$ along with a nonempty closed constraint set Q, the *directional* *generalized Fermat-Torricelli* problem is

$$\text{minimize } \mathcal{T}_1(x) = \sum_{i\in I} T_{v_i}(x;\Omega_i) \text{ subject to } x \in Q. \tag{5.12}$$

Another problem under our consideration is the *directional generalized Sylvester problem*:

$$\text{minimize } \mathcal{S}_1(x) := \max_{i\in I}\ T_{v_i}(x;\Omega_i) \text{ subject to } x \in Q. \tag{5.13}$$

Let us start with some theoretical analysis of problem (5.13) and refer the reader to [22] for the analysis of problem (5.12). It is not hard to prove the proposition below following the proof in [22].

Proposition 5.2 *Suppose $Q \cap \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$. Problem* (5.13) *admits an optimal solution if at least one of the set among Q and Ω_i for $i \in I$ is compact.*

Let us now provide a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of an optimal solution.

Lemma 5.3 *If f is convex on $[x,y]$, and there exists $t_0 \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$f(t_0x + (1-t_0)y) = t_0f(x) + (1-t_0)f(y),$$

then

$$f(tx + (1-t)y) = tf(x) + (1-t)f(y), \text{ for all } t \in [0,1].$$

Proof. Suppose by the contradiction that there exists $t_1 \neq t_0$ such that

$$f(t_1x + (1-t_1)y) < t_1f(x) + (1-t_1)f(y).$$

Consider the case $t_0 < t_1$. Put $z_0 = t_0x + (1-t_0)y, z_1 = t_1x + (1-t_1)y$. Then

$$z_0 = \frac{t_0}{t_1}z_1 + (1 - \frac{t_0}{t_1})y.$$

By the convexity of f and the hypothesis, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
f(z_0) &\leq \frac{t_0}{t_1}f(z_1) + (1-\frac{t_0}{t_1})f(y)\\
&< \frac{t_0}{t_1}\left[t_1f(x) + (1-t_1)f(y)\right] + (1-\frac{t_0}{t_1})f(y)\\
&= t_0f(x) + (1-t_0)f(y)\\
&= f(z_0).
\end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. The case where $t_0 > t_1$ can be proved in a similar way. □

Lemma 5.4 *Let* $f = \max_{i\in I} f_i$*, where* f_i *for* $i \in I$ *are convex functions on* $[x, y]$*. Suppose that there exists* $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ *such that*

$$f(t_0x + (1 - t_0)y) = t_0f(x) + (1 - t_0)f(y).$$

Then

$$f(u) = f_i(u), \text{ for all } u \in [x, y],$$

and for any $i \in A(z) := \{i \in \{1, \dots , n\} \mid f(z) = f_i(z)\}$ *and* $z = t_0x + (1 - t_0)y$*.*

Proof. Put $z = t_0x + (1 - t_0)y$. Since f is convex on $[x, y]$ and Lemma 5.3, one has

$$f(tx + (1 - t)y) = tf(x) + (1 - t)f(y), \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

Take $i \in I$ such that $f(z) = f_i(z)$. Then

$$f(z) = f_i(z) = f_i(t_0x + (1 - t_0)y) \le t_0f_i(x) + (1 - t_0)f_i(y) \le t_0f(x) + (1 - t_0)f(y) = f(z).$$

This implies,

$$f_i(t_0x + (1 - t_0)y) = t_0f_i(x) + (1 - t_0)f_i(y),$$

and

$$f_i(x) = f(x), f_i(y) = f(y).$$

The former implies that

$$f_i(tx + (1 - t)y) = tf_i(x) + (1 - t)f_i(y) \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

Now, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$f_i(tx + (1 - t)y) = tf_i(x) + (1 - t)f_i(y) = tf(x) + (1 - t)f(y) = f\left(tx + (1 - t)y\right).$$

The proof is now complete. □

The proof of the lemma below can be found in [21, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 5.5 *Let* S *be nonempty closed convex set. Suppose that* g *is a nonnegative convex function on* S*. Then the function defined by*

$$h(x) := (g(x))^2$$

is strictly convex on S *if and only if* g *is not constant on any line segment* $[x, y]$ *in* S*, where* $x \neq y$*.*

For $x \in \text{dom } T_v(\cdot; \Omega)$, define

$$\Pi_v(x; \Omega) = x + T_v(x; \Omega)v.$$

Lemma 5.6 *If* Ω *is a nonempty closed convex set,* $x, y \in \text{dom } T_v(\cdot; \Omega) \setminus \Omega$ *and* $x - y \in \mathbb{R}v$*, then*

$$\Pi_v(x; \Omega) \equiv \Pi_v(y; \Omega).$$

Proof. Because of the equal role of x and y, we can assume without lost of generality that $x - y = \lambda v, \lambda > 0$. Suppose by contradiction that $\Pi_v(x;\Omega) \neq \Pi_v(y;\Omega)$, which is equivalent to

$$[x + T_v(x;\Omega)v] - [y + T_v(y;\Omega)v] = [\lambda + T_v(x;\Omega) - T_v(y;\Omega)]v \neq 0.$$

So, $\lambda + T_v(x;\Omega) - T_v(y;\Omega) \neq 0$. If $\lambda \leq T_v(y;\Omega)$ then by [22, Proposition 2.8], one has

$$T_v(x;\Omega) = T_v\left(y + \lambda v;\Omega\right) = T_v(y;\Omega) - \lambda.$$

Thus, $\lambda > T_v(y;\Omega)$. Using $\Pi_v(y;\Omega) = y + T_v(y;\Omega)v = x - \lambda v + T_v(y;\Omega)v$ and $\Pi_v(x;\Omega) = x + T_v(x;\Omega)v$, we get

$$x = \frac{T_v(x;\Omega)}{\lambda - T_v(y;\Omega) + T_v(x;\Omega)}\Pi_v(y;\Omega) + \frac{\lambda - T_v(y;\Omega)}{\lambda - T_v(y;\Omega) + T_v(x;\Omega)}\Pi_v(x;\Omega).$$

Notice that $\Pi_v(x;\Omega), \Pi_v(y;\Omega) \in \Omega$ and Ω is convex, which implies $x \in \Omega$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 5.7 *If Ω is a nonempty closed strictly convex set, then $T_v(x;\Omega)$ is not constant on any line segment $[x, y] \subseteq \operatorname{dom} T_v(\cdot;\Omega) \setminus \Omega$, where $x \neq y$.*

Proof. If $x - y \notin \mathbb{R}v$, then by [22, Proposition 2.7], $T_v(\cdot;\Omega)$ is strictly convex on $[x, y]$, so $T_v(\frac{x+y}{2};\Omega) < \max\{T_v(x;\Omega), T_v(y;\Omega)\}$. Consider the case where $x - y = \lambda v,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then by Lemma 5.6 one has $\Pi_v(x;\Omega) = \Pi_v(y;\Omega)$, and hence $x + T_v(x;\Omega)v = y + T_v(y;\Omega)v$. Then $[\lambda + T_v(x;\Omega) - T_v(y;\Omega)]\,v = 0$. This implies, $T_v(y;\Omega) = \lambda + T_v(x;\Omega)$. Therefore, $T_v(x;\Omega) \neq T_v(y;\Omega)$. Thus, $T_v(\cdot;\Omega)$ is not constant on $[x, y]$. $\square$

Theorem 5.8 *Suppose that $Q \subseteq \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \cup_{i \in I}\Omega_i$, Q is convex and Ω_i, $\in I$, are strictly convex. Then the optimization problem* (5.13) *has at most one optimal solution.*

Proof. Consider the problem

$$\text{minimize } [\mathcal{S}_1(x)]^2 = \max\{[T_{v_i}(x;\Omega_i)]^2 \ \mid i \in I\} \text{ subject to } x \in Q. \tag{5.14}$$

It is easy to show that $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution of the problem (5.13) if and only if it is also an optimal solution of problem (5.14). By Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.7, each $T_{v_i}(\cdot;\Omega_i)$ is strictly convex on Q and so is $\mathcal{S}_1^2$. Thus, the optimization problem (5.13) has at most one optimal solution. $\square$

5.2 Subgradient-Type Algorithms

Let us now present numerical algorithms for solving problem (5.12). For simplicity, we only consider the stochastic subgradient method. The following theorem [22] plays an important role in our study.

Theorem 5.9 *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } T_v(\cdot;\Omega)$, where Ω is convex. Then*

$$\partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega) = \begin{cases} N(\bar{x},\Omega) \cap \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, -v\rangle \le 1\}, \textit{ if } \bar{x} \in \Omega, \\ N(\bar{x} + T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)v, \Omega) \cap \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, v\rangle = -1\}, \textit{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.15}$$

From formula (5.15), we see that if $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, then $0 \in \partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)$. Moreover, in the case where $\bar{x} \notin \Omega$, if it is possible to find the normal cone to Ω at the *projection point* $\Pi_{v_i}(x_k;\Omega_i) := \bar{x} + T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)v$ explicitly, then we can find a subgradient of $\partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)$.

Proposition 5.10 *Let Ω be a nonempty closed convex set. Fix $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } T_v(\cdot;\Omega) \setminus \Omega$. Suppose that*

$$N(\tilde{x};\Omega) = \text{cone } \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\},$$

where $\langle w_i, v\rangle < 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\tilde{x} := \bar{x} + T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)v$. Then

$$-\frac{w_i}{\langle w_i, v\rangle} \in \partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega) \textit{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Proof. It is clear that the vector $x^* := -\dfrac{w_i}{\langle w_i, v\rangle}$ satisfies the conditions $x^* \in N(\tilde{x};\Omega)$ and $\langle x^*, v\rangle = -1$. Therefore, $x^* \in \partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)$ by Theorem 5.9. $\square$

Remark 5.11 The proof of the previous proposition shows that if $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } T_v(\cdot;\Omega) \setminus \Omega$ with $w \in N(\tilde{x};\Omega)$ and $\langle w, v\rangle < 0$, then $-\frac{w}{\langle w,v\rangle} \in T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)$.

Corollary 5.12 *Let Ω be nonempty closed convex set. Fix $\bar{x} \in \text{int}(\text{dom } T_v) \setminus \Omega$. Suppose that $N(\tilde{x};\Omega) = \text{cone } \{w\}$, where $w \neq 0$ and $\tilde{x} := \bar{x} + T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)v$. Then $\langle w, v\rangle < 0$ and*

$$\partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega) = \big\{ -\frac{w}{\langle w, v\rangle} \big\}. \tag{5.16}$$

Moreover, $T_v(\cdot;\Omega)$ is differentiable at $\bar{x}$.

Proof. Since $\bar{x} \in \text{int}(\text{dom } T_v)$, it is well-known that $\partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega) \neq \emptyset$. Fix $u \in \partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega)$. By Theorem 5.9,

$$u \in N(\tilde{x},\Omega) \cap \{x^* \in X^* \mid \langle v, x^*\rangle = -1\}.$$

It is clear that $u \neq 0$, otherwise $\langle u, v\rangle = 0 \neq -1$. Thus, there exists $t > 0$ such that $u = tw$, and hence $\langle tw, v\rangle = -1$. This implies $\langle w, v\rangle < 0$ and $t = \dfrac{-1}{\langle w, v\rangle}$. We have proved that $u = -\dfrac{w}{\langle w, v\rangle}$. Formula (5.16) has been proved. Since the subdifferential of the function T_v at $\bar{x}$ is a singleton, this function is differentiable at $\bar{x}$. $\square$

Example 5.13 Let $\Omega := \{(x,\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \lambda \ge |x|\}$ and let $v = (0,1)$. Fix $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \notin \Omega$. If $\bar{x}_1 = 0$, one can see that

$$\partial T_v(\bar{x};\Omega) = \begin{cases} \{(a,-1) \mid -1 \le a \le 1\} & \text{if } \bar{x}_1 = 0, \\ \{(-1,-1)\} & \text{if } \bar{x}_1 < 0, \\ \{(1,-1)\} & \text{if } \bar{x}_1 > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let us write a pseudo code for problem (5.12) using the stochastic subgradient method. The readers can easily write the pseudo code using other subgradient-type methods. In the algorithm below, for simplicity, below and thereafter, we assume that $v_i \in \text{int } [\Omega_i]_\infty$ for $i \in I$. Then the corresponding directional minimal time functions are globally Lipschitz; see [22].

```
INPUT: $p$, $K$, $v_i$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, and a sequence of step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{T}_1(x_1)$
FOR   $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Choose $A_k$, $|A_k| = p$, to be a nonempty subset of of $I$,
    uniformly at random
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
    Find $u_{ki} \in N(\Pi_{v_i}(x_k; \Omega_i); \Omega_i)$ with $\langle u_{ki}, v_i \rangle = -1$ for $i \in A_k$
    end if
    Set $\widetilde{w}_k := \frac{|I|}{p}(\sum_{i \in A_k} u_{ki})$
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k \widetilde{w}_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{T}_1(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{T}_1(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

For $u \in Q$, define

$$A(u) := \{i \in I \mid \mathcal{S}_1(u) = T_{v_i}(u; \Omega_i)\}.$$

Let us now present a pseudo code for solving problem (5.13) based on the subgradient algorithm.

```
INPUT: $p$, $K$, $v_i$, $\Omega_i$ for $i \in I$, and a sequence of step sizes $(\alpha_k)$
INITIALIZE: Choose a starting point $x_1$ and compute $V_1 = \mathcal{S}_1(x_1)$
FOR   $k = 1, \ldots, K$
    Choose $i \in A(x_k)$
    if $x_k \notin \Omega_i$
    Find $w_k \in N(\Pi_{v_i}(x_k; \Omega_i); \Omega_i)$ with $\langle w_k, v_i \rangle = -1$ for $i \in A_k$
    else
    set $w_k = 0$; break ($x_k$ is an optimal solution)
    end if
    Set $x_{k+1} := \Pi(x_k - \alpha_k w_k; Q)$
    Compute $V_{k+1} := \min\{V_k, \mathcal{S}_1(x_{k+1})\}$
OUTPUT: $V_{K+1}$ and $x_k$ such that $\mathcal{S}_1(x_k) = V_{K+1}$
```

Conclusion Remarks: In this paper, we apply different subgradient-type algorithms to new models of set facility location. In the next version of the paper, we will update with more examples to compare the methods. The subgradient-type algorithms presented in the paper are easy to implement, and can be used to deal with a broad range of situations. In some particular settings, there are of course other alternatives. We will consider that in our future research.

References

[1] D. Bertsekas, A. Nedic, and A. Ozdaglar, *Convex Analysis and Optimization*, Athena Scientific, Boston, 2003.

[2] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, Convex Optimization, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2004.

[3] S. Boyd, L. Xiao, A. Mutapcic, Subgradient methods, Lecture Notes (2003).

[4] J. Brimberg, The Fermat Weber location problem revisited. Math. Program. 71 (1995), 71–76.

[5] J. Brimberg, R. Chen, D. Chen, Accelerating convergence in the Fermat-Weber location problem. Oper. Res. Lett. 22 (1998), 151–157.

[6] E. Chi and K. Lange, A look at the generalized Heron problem through the lens of majorization-minimization, Amer. Math. Monthly, to appear.

[7] F.H. Clarke, Y.S. Ledyaev, R.J. Stern, P.R. Wolenski, Nonsmooth Analysis and Control Theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 178. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[8] L. Cooper and I. Katz, The Weber problem revisited. Comput Math Appl 7 (1981), 225–234.

[9] Drezner, On the convergence of the generalized Weiszfeld algorithm. Ann Oper Res 167 (2009), 327–336.

[10] U. Eckhardt, Weber's problem and Weiszfeld's algorithm in general spaces, Math. Program. 18 (1980) 186–196.

[11] F. Giannessi, Constrained Optimization and Image Space Analysis, Vol. 1. Separation of Sets and Optimality Conditions, Math. Concepts Methods Sci. Engrg. 49, Springer, New York (2005).

[12] H.W. Kuhn, A note on Fermat-Torricelli problem, Math. Program. 4 (1973), 98–107.

[13] M. Bacak, Computing medians and means in Hadamard spaces, arXiv:1210.2145.

[14] B.S. Mordukhovich, N.M. Nam, and C. Villalobos, The smallest enclosing ball problem and the smallest intersecting ball problem: existence and uniqueness of optimal solutions, Optim. Lett. 154 (2012), 768–791.

[15] B.S. Mordukhovich, N.M. Nam, and J. Salinas, Applications of variational analysis to a generalized Heron problem, Appl. Anal. 91 (2012), 1915–1942.

[16] B.S. Mordukhovich and N.M. Nam, Applications of variational analysis to a generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 148 (2011), 431–454.

[17] B.S. Mordukhovich and N.M. Nam, *A Simple Path to Convex Analysis and Applications*, to appear in Morgan & Claypool (Synthesis Lectures on Mathematics and Statistics: book series edited by S.G. Krantz).

[18] J.G. Morris and W.A. Verdini, Minisum ℓ_p distance location problems solved via a perturbed problem and Weiszfeld's algorithm, Operations Research 27 (1979), 1180–1188.

[19] N.M. Nam, N.T. An, and C. Villalobos, *Minimal time functions and the smallest intersecting ball problem generated by unbounded dynamics*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. **154** (2012), 768–791.

[20] N.M. Nam, N.T. An, and J. Salinas, Applications of convex analysis to the smallest intersecting ball problem, J. Convex Anal. 19 (2012), 497–518.

[21] N.M. Nam and N. Hoang, A generalized Sylvester problem and a generalized Fermat-Torricelli problem, to appear in Journal of Convex Analysis.

[22] N.M. Nam, C. Zalinescu, Variational analysis of directional minimal time functions and applications to location problems, to appear in Set-Valued and Variational Analysis.

[23] A. Nedic and D. Bertsekas, Incremental subgradient methods for nondifferentiable optimization, SIAM J. Optim. **12** (2001), 109-138.

[24] F. Plastria, The Weiszfeld algorithm: proof, amendments and extensions, H.A. Eiselt and V. Marianov (Eds.) Foundations of Location Analysis, International Series in Operations Research and Management Science, vol 155, Springer, 2011, 357-389.

[25] R. T. Rockafellar, onvex Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.

[26] A. Ruszczyński, Nonlinear Optimization, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.

[27] Shalev-Shwartz, S., Singer, Y., and Srebro, N. (2007), PEGASOS: Primal Estimated sub-GrAdient SOlver for SVM. In International conference on machine learning (ICML) (pp. 807814). New York: ACM.

[28] N. Z. Shor, Minimization Methods for Non-differentiable Functions, Springer-Verlag, 1985.

[29] H. Üster and R.F. Love, The convergence of the Weiszfeld algorithm. Comput. Math. Appl. 40 (2000), 443451.

[30] Y. Vardi and C-H. Zhang, A modified Weiszfeld algorithm for the Fermat-Weber location problem. Math. Program. 90 (2001), Ser. A, 559–566.

[31] E. Weiszfeld, Sur le point pour lequel la somme des distances de n points donnés est minimum, Tôhoku Mathematics Journal 43 (1937), 355–386.

[32] E. Weiszfeld and F. Plastria, On the point for which the sum of the distances to n given points is minimum. Ann Oper Res 167 (2009), 7–41.